<center>**REMARKS**</center>

In the Official Action mailed on **19 January 2011**, Examiner reviewed claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-18 and 20. Examiner rejected claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Orsic (U.S. Patent No. 4,817,082, hereinafter "Orsic"). Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orsic, in view of Erimli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,842,423, hereinafter "Erimli").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Examiner rejected independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Orsic. More specifically, in rejecting this claim, Examiner argued as follows:

> **Orsic** teaches [...] wherein the acknowledgement signal is not issued unless the receiver has asserted an enabling signal to the cell that indicates that the receiver is ready to receive data (see column 3 lines 48-68 through column 4 lines 1-6 and 16-20, also column 5 lines 12-26 and 37-53, column 6 lines 15-18 and Figure 2; item 108 Flip Flop, item III Logic Circuit and item 104-1 B-line; a signal based on the e-bit and a signal indicating the receive is ready to receive from the transmitter) and a flow-control signal has been asserted by the receiver (see column 6 lines 28-36; "receiver"/output controller provides flow control and applies a busy signal to stop the flow of packets).[1]

Although not agreeing with the rejection based on the previous language of independent claim 11, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that the acknowledgement signal is generated by logically combining a previous acknowledge signal generated from the cell and an acknowledgement signal from a neighboring cell with the flow-control signal. These amendments find support

---

1 see office action, pages 3-4; emphasis added

<center>7</center>

throughout the instant application; for example, in FIGs. 6-7 of the instant application.

As discussed in Applicant's past remarks, Orsic discloses a crosspoint switching system.[2] In the Orsic system, an output controller "can stop the flow of packets to it […] by applying a busy signal."[3] Orsic generally describes that the crosspoint element includes a logic circuit that receives the busy signal.[4] For example, Orsic discloses the logic circuit receiving the busy signal and generating a grant signal. Orsic does not disclose the grant signal being generated using a previous acknowledge signal generated from the cell. Hence, Orsic cannot disclose that the acknowledgement signal is generated by logically combining a previous acknowledge signal generated from the cell and an acknowledgement signal from a neighboring cell with the flow-control signal.

Because Orsic nowhere discloses, either expressly or inherently, the embodiments claimed in amended independent claim 11, Orsic cannot anticipate the claimed embodiments.[5] Applicant therefore respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the independent claims in the instant application under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Orsic. Applicant further requests the withdrawal of the rejection of any dependent claims in the instant application based on Orsic for the same reason.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Examiner rejected independent claims 1 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orsic, in view of Erimli. More specifically, in rejecting the independent claims, Examiner argued as follows (using the rejection of claim 1 as exemplary):

---

2 see at least Applicant's remarks filed 03 November 2010, page 10
3 see Orsic, col. 6, lines 33-36
4 see *id.*, col. 5, line 37, to col. 6, line 25; also, FIG. 2
5 see MPEP § 2131

PJA Amendment E SUN-P9550 (non final OAR).doc

According to Erimli, a multi port switch may include a receiver, a transmitter, flow control logic, buffer management, token bucket, etc (see Erimli column 4 lines 22-32). A first logic element operates upon mask signals and threshold signals. The first logic element may include multiple logic devices that each generate a flow control signal. A second logic element operates upon flow control signals from the first element (previous signals). The second logic element may generate a flow control signal. The flow control signal from both the first and second logic elements may be sent to the flow control logic (see Erimli column 7 line 39 - column 8 line 15, column 9 lines 5-16 and Figures 3 and 4).[6]

Although not agreeing with the rejection based on the previous language of independent claims 1 and 20, Applicant has amended these claims to clarify that logic for generating the acknowledgement signal logically combines a previous acknowledge signal from the cell **and an acknowledgement signal from a neighboring cell** with the flow-control signal. These amendments find support throughout the instant application; for example, in FIGs. 6-7 of the instant application.

Erimli discloses a system for priority-based flow control masking. The Erimli system includes a flow-control mask register for storing programmable mask signals.[7] Erimli discloses generating a flow-control signal per output port using threshold signals for the port and the flow-control mask register.[8] Hence, as shown in Erimli FIG. 5, in the Erimli system the flow-control signal is generated using threshold signals **for the port**. Erimli nowhere discloses logically combining a previous acknowledge signal from the cell and an acknowledgement signal **from a neighboring cell.**

In rejecting the independent claims, Examiner expressly acknowledged that Orsic does not disclose logic for generating the acknowledgement signal:

---

6 see office action, page 7; emphasis added
7 see Erimli, col. 7, lines 53-63
8 see *id.*, col. 7, line 40, to col. 8, line 15; also, FIG. 4

PJA Amendment E SUN-P9550 (non final OAR).doc

Orsic does not teach and wherein the flow control mechanism comprises logic for generating the acknowledgement signal by logically combining a previous acknowledge signal from the cell with the flow-control signal.[9]

Hence, Orsic cannot disclose logically combining a previous acknowledge signal from the cell and an acknowledgement signal from a neighboring cell.

Because Erimli, and Erimli in combination with Orsic, nowhere discloses the embodiments claimed in amended independent claims 1 and 20, Erimli and Orsic cannot render the claimed embodiments obvious.[10] Applicant therefore respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 20 in the instant application under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Erimli and Orsic. Applicant further requests the withdrawal of the rejection of any dependent claims in the instant application based on Erimli and Orsic for the same reason.

Additional Claims

Applicant has added claim 21, which is directed to embodiments wherein the acknowledgement signal from the neighboring cell is generated by combining a previous acknowledge signal from the neighboring cell and an acknowledgement signal from a cell neighboring the neighboring cell with a flow-control signal received by the neighboring cell from a receiver for the neighboring cell. This claim finds support throughout the instant application; for example, as shown in FIGs. 6-7 of the instant application.

---

9 see office action, page 7; emphasis removed
10 see MPEP §§ 2141(III) and 2143.01(I)-(VI)

PJA Amendment E SUN-P9550 (non final OAR).doc

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /Anthony Jones/
        Anthony Jones
        Registration No. 59,521

Date: 19 April 2011

Anthony Jones
Park, Vaughan, Fleming & Dowler, LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com